Assessment Committee
Minutes for 11/10/10

Call to order – 2:30 PM

Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy Benson</td>
<td>CAS [Vacancy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Trechter</td>
<td>Mike Miller, Provost Designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Miller, Provost</td>
<td>CAS Designee [ex officio]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desi Greene [ex officio]*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Hadley*</td>
<td>Anthony Varghese*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Holleran</td>
<td>Scott Woitaszewski*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Luebke</td>
<td>CAS [Vacancy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy O'Connell</td>
<td>Faye Perkins CEPS Interim Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Southworth</td>
<td>Director of Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research [ex officio]*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Absent

Approval of Minutes: Motion to accept the October 6, 2010 minutes as presented was made by David Trechter and seconded by Tracy O’Connell and seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Mid-Cycle Review: Joy reminded the committee that their mid-cycle program reviews should be completed by December 21, 2010. The CSIS program has made some changes to their plan. Joy will send David this copy since it is different from the one posted on the assessment web-page.

Program Reviews: The 7-year review for Political Science has been delayed until 2011-2012. The audit and review for Psychology has been delayed until UWRF received a response from the UW System regarding the substitution of external accrediting reviews.

At the last meeting, the committee had expressed an interest in working on the spring reviews together. There are 10 programs being reviewed. Faye stated that the self-study reports would be posted in March with the meeting beginning in April. Since our committee reviews the plans/reports and the assessment narrative in the self-study, Joy stated that this would require meeting 2-3 times with three to five programs discussed each time. The self-study documents would be read in advance of the meetings. It was the consensus of those present to try this approach, with the understanding that it could change.

NEW BUSINESS

Program Prioritization: Joy stated that Jim Madsen will be asking the committee to provide input in the revision of the program preordination criteria.

e-Portfolios: Heidi shared feedback from three of the four vendor presentation that the ILTC committee had arranged. She stated that Chalk and Wire and LiveText were the two best, in her opinion. Joy shared Scott Wojtanowski perspectives on the e-portfolio process after the vendor presentations. Need a broader discussion regarding if/should e-portfolios be a part of the UWRF assessment efforts and let this shape a tool selection. Briefly discussed breadth of the issue: general education, individual program efforts, and college level initiatives. Also who would pay – UWRF or would it be added to student fees [requires student senate]. Joy will follow-up with Scott.

Assessment Coordinator: Joy shared that she and Jim Madsen were meeting with the Provost on 11/11/10 regarding the status of campus assessment leadership. Key points from the committee discussion:

1. Should we have a campus assessment coordinator? Either focused on just AoL or ½ time on this and ½ time on something else.

2. Members of the committee discussed pros and cons of the coordinator position versus other options given:
a. There are the mechanics of assessment [data collection, putting plans online, etc.]. Do we need to have faculty doing the mechanics or can these be done through administrative staff/institutional research, uploading plans, maintaining reports, etc.

b. Then there is the helping to create ‘a culture of assessment’ piece. The latter requires many voices – Assessment committee, Deans, IT, Senate, etc.
   i. Have a budget for the Assessment Committee/Provost to use to bring in speakers, host campus assessment fairs, etc.
   ii. Use campus experts
   iii. Need joint conversations to articulate what we want to achieve through assessment.
   iv. Assessment is an ongoing/robust process and needs to be seen as shared.
   v. If we increase the role of program achievement of learning outcomes in the program prioritization/resource allocation role, then shared is even more important.
   vi. College assessment coordinators as part of the assessment committee. Issue of reassigned time could get lost or is part of service, yet they are link pins college/committee.

c. Concern about taking ½ time of a faculty member out of the classroom.

d. Given the charge to the assessment committee, there is 1] a significant leadership role that can be strengthened and 2] overlaps with some of the elements of the former Assessment Coordinator position. Key charge areas:
   i. Examine the University’s assessment effort in light of the select mission and nature of UWRF.
   ii. Propose changes in the assessment effort to the faculty senate.
   iii. Provide faculty input into University reports on assessment.
   iv. Assess general education and university requirements.
   v. Act as a resource on academic assessment – work with academic programs to provide guidance on the form and structure of their assessment plans.
   vi. Monitor assessment activities

e. There is a high opportunity cost given using faculty resources for the AC position.

f. Resource question of assessment coordinator given other resource needs.

Adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

Submitted by Joy Benson